

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Application No.: 10/773,613                                      | Confirmation No.: 7774  |
| Applicant: Daniel J. SCALES et al.                               | Group Art Unit: 2156  |
| Filing Date: 02/06/2004  | Examiner: Jason G. LIAO   |
| Docket No.: A041   | <b>INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37<br/>C.F.R. 1.133 AND COMMENTS ON<br/>STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR<br/>ALLOWANCE</b> |
| Customer No.: 36378  |   |
| For: PROVIDING MULTIPLE<br>CONCURRENT ACCESS TO A FILE<br>SYSTEM |   |

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowance mailed October 5, 2010, this written statement is provided. An **Interview Summary** may be found on page **2** of this paper and **Comments on Statement for Reasons for Allowance** can be found on page **3** of this paper.

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

A telephone interview was conducted between Examiner Liao and Applicants' undersigned representative on July 27, 2010. Mr. Darryl Smith was also present. The parties discussed the applicability of the secondary reference, Yamakawa (U.S. Patent Publication 2006/0069655) cited in the Final Office Action dated January 29, 2010 and the differences in Applicants' claims over the primary reference, Valhalia (U.S. Patent 6,389,420). Agreement was reached that the claims were in allowable condition. Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview which expedited the processing of the application.

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT FOR REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

In the Notice of Allowance mailed on October 5, 2010, the Office stated, in part, that an “understanding of thick client management” removed previous concerns. Because the term “thick client management” has not been previously used, Applicants desire to clarify that the term is used to refer to the ability of a computing entity (e.g., a client) to access data in a file system “without needing another computing entity acting on its behalf,” as recited in the allowed independent claims, which, for example, distinguishes the allowed claims from prior art that utilize intermediary file servers or a lock-granting server nodes that act on behalf of the computing entity.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 1, 2010

By: /Daniel Lin/  
Daniel Lin  
Registration No. 47,750  
Attorney for Applicants

3401 Hillview Ave.  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Tel.: (650) 427-3096